Messrs E. P. Dutton & Co. have published a volume entitled Further Memoirs of the Whig Party (1807-21), With Some Miscellaneous Reminiscences,-by HENRY RICH-ARD VASSALL, third Lord Holland. Fifty years have elapsed since the appearance of the last published instalment of the work which this volume will complete. About ten years after his father's death, Henry Edward, fourth and last Lord Holland, took in hand the publication of his father's mem-"The Foreign Reminiscences" appeared in 1851, the first volume of the "Memoirs of the Whig Party" in 1852 and the second volume in 1854. The editor of the book before us, Lord Stavordale, finds it impossible to explain why the fourth Lord Holland falls before the completion of his task. Probably, however, the state of his health-he died in 1859-accounts for the postponement of the undertaking. The four books or chapters here presented deal with the period of English history between 1807 and 1821. No one was better qualified than the third Lord Holland to relate the political occurrences of the years which are fraught with so much interest for the student of England's annals. He was recognized as one of the prominent leaders of the Whig party after his uncle Charles James Fox's death, and by his intimate connection with him was brought in contact with many persons of note who were finishing their destined span of life when he had barely entered the age of manhood.

Before directing attention to some of his interesting recollections, we should remind the reader who the author of these memoirs was. Henry Richard, third Lord Holland, was born in 1773, at Winterslow, near Salisbury. His father, Stephen Fox, eldest son of Henry Fox, Paymaster-General in the reign of George II. (who was raised to the peerage in 1763, and died in 1774), lived but six months after his accession to the title. The boy was left to the care of his uncles, Lord Upper Ossory and Charles James Fox, and he was educated at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford. On leaving the university, in 1792, he went abroad, and was absent from England, with the exception of two or three visits, until 1796. Part of those, years were spent in Spain, and from this period dates his love of the literature and art of that country of romance and his interest in the political condition of its people. Lord Holland passed the greater portion of the remainder of those years in France and Italy. While travelling in the latter country with his friend, Lord Wycombe (afterward second Lord Lansdowne), he met Elizabeth Lady Webster, wife of Sir Godfrey Webster of Battle Abbey, in Sussex. The chance meeting was destined to alter the whole course of their lives, and after many months spent in various parts of the Continent they returned to England together in 1798. Sir Godfrey obtained a divorce in July, 1797. and Lord Holland married Lady Webster two days later. One son was born before the marriage, afterward known as Gen. Charles Fox and the husband of Lady Mary Fitzelarence, daughter of William IV. and Mrs. Jordan. Lady Holland, who was a daughter of Richard Vassall and Mary, daughter of Thomas Clark of New York, who afterward became Lady Affleck, succeeded to large properties in Jamaica after the death of ber father in 1795. The greater portion of her income was made over to Sir Godfrey Webster at the time of her divorce. On his death, in 1800, Lady Holland regained her own, and she and Lord Holland then took the additional name of Vassall.

Lord Holland's political career began in 1798 with his speech in the House of Lords on the Assessed Taxes bill, on which occasion he showed himself a worthy representative of his family It was not long before he was recognized as the authorized exponent of his uncle's policy in the House of Lords. Lord Holland received no office in Lord Grenville's Administration until after the death of his uncle, Charles James Fox. He then entered the Cabinet as Lord Privy Seal, but his tenure of the post was of short duration, as the Tory party returned to office early in 1807. For the next twenty-three years he remained in opposition and took a leading part in the councils of the Whig party during that period. When in 1830 Lord Grey formed a Ministry Lord Holland accepted the post of Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, with a seat in the Cabinet. This he retained until his death in 1840, with the exception of the short interval in 1831-35 when his party was out of office. His wife survived him only five years. They left besides Gen. Charles Fox one son, Henry Edward, who succeeded to the title, and one daughter, who married Lord Cilford and died in 1891.

The memoir of which we here have the final instalment was written to serve as a record of the internal history of the Whig party during a critical period of its history. The editor, Lord Stavordale, points out that political feeling at the beginning of the nineteenth century was far more virulent than at the present day. The line between the opposing parties was much more strictly drawn, and for a time the relations between the leaders of each side were limited to invectives hurled across the table of the House of Commons. Lord Holland teils us that when he began to take a part in public affairs this state of things was undergoing a gradual alteration. and he mentioned "the difference which a change in the habits of society had insensibly wrought in political parties." politician he viewed the change with no favorable eye, for he goes on to say: "The comparative disuse of men-dinners, while no doubt improving the intercourse of private life, has nevertheless very sensibly impaired the strength and union of party zeal and connection."

Although in dealing with the characters of individual statesmen and celebrities of his time Lord Holland is sometimes led by his personal feelings to depart from his customary sense of justice, the memoir has been published as it stands, with the exception of two or three short passages and notes which were considered unnecessary.

11. In the present notice we shall confine ourseives mainly to Lord Holland's "Miscellaneous Recollections," which are set forth in a supplementary chapter, begun in 1826, but we ought at least to glance at what the author says about the Duke of Wellington and about Sheridan. Neither should we altogether overlook an interesting conversation dealing with the "Junius" controversy which is inserted in an ap-

Lord Holland had conceived a favorable opinion of Wellington during the Peninsular War, but subsequently he felt a deepening mistrust of his ulterior motives. His worst offence, in Lord Holland's eyes, seems to have been his conduct in Paris and his failure to save Marshal Ney from execution. Wellington took umbrage at a passage in letter written by Lord Holland to Lord Kinnaird on behalf of Marshal Ney, and for some years the two did not speak. Subsequently, however, they visited one another, and political differences did not in-

terrupt the interchange of civilities between them. Our author's recollections of Wellington will be found on pages 229-232 Lord Holland could remember Arthur Wellesley at Eton, though the latter was older than himself. He was in no way, we are told, distinguished there. Soon afterward, both in his regiment and in Ireland, he was, perhaps from contrast with his elder brother (subsequently the Marquis of Wellesley), reckoned below mediocrity. In Dublin Castle his companions treated him as a good humored, insignificant youth, and in India he was thought to require all Lord Wellesley's affection and interest to screen him from disgrace. Lord Holland says in a footnote that he once asked an East Indian who knew the details of the transaction if his brother, Lord Wellesley, the Governor-General, had not raised Arthur from the ground. "The ground?" replied he. "The mire, the filth. He was lost but for Wellesley." It is said that the complaisance or good nature of Sir John Harris on one occasion procured Arthur Wellesley the peerage which he must have owed primarily to Lord Wellesley's recommendation. The warning, however, which he received when his brother shielded him from disgrace roused the faculties of Arthur Wellesley. From that period he devoted himself to business and his profession. He rose rapidly through the gradations of a good officer and useful man of business to much consideration both in the State and the army. He showed discretion, temper and judgment in defence of his brother against an impeachment in 1806, and in the following year he was designated by Lord Grenville to command a large expedition to Mexico. Soon afterward he began his career in Portugal.

Lord Holland's opinion of Wellington was formed very early. He considers him not only a very capable and useful but a great fortunate and extraordinary man, both in politics and in war. "No one ever possessed greater dexterity in adapting his means to his ends. His want of any remarkable exterior accomplishments only renders this faculty more wonderful. It is possible that his wisdom may not be of the most enlarged and comprehensive, and certainly not of the most refined and delicate kind; but it is so unerring on all great occasions that it partakes at least of the character of genius. Then his apprehension is quick, his sagacity marvellous, his application indefatigable, and his decision and courage unfailing." On the other hand, Lord Holland pronounces it rare for a man of sense, education and spirit to be more destitute of taste, wit, grace or imagination than the Duke of Wellington was. "He affects none of them, and is often humble or adroit enough to profit by the allowance made for their absence. He loves to display a knowledge of details, even when he possesses it very imperfectly; but, in general, his conversation and manners have the ineffable charm of unassuming simplicity. Though he is very close, and his designs quite impenetrable, he speaks of past transactions with great readiness and ease, and has all the air of being frank and communicative. He has not quick or delicate feelings, and generosity is not the chief ingredient in his composition. On the other hand, he has few bad passions, and can subdue them effectually when his interests, or even his convenience, require it." Lord Holland adds that good humored as Wellington seemed in social life, he was said to be often indifferent and even harsh to inferiors, which, if true, is a trait not rendered less unamiable by the proof which his demeanor with equals affords that he can control his dislike, conceal his chagrin, stifle his resentments and command his temper when he chooses. His vanity, I have sometimes thought, exceeds his ambition; for he has occasionally seemed to prefer the appearance to the reality of doing whatever he liked. Opinions and principles may possibly sit rather loosely upon his That Wellington was unamishoulders." able toward those to whom he thought he could be rude with impunity seems to be confirmed by his unpopularity with corps that he commanded, and especially with

the Engineers and Artillery.

latter's nephew, the author of these memoirs, does not hesitate to mix some censure with praise of him. He speaks of him at considerable length in pages 236-249. He his creditors was so won by his anxiety begins by admitting that he himself had shared some portion of Sheridan's friendship, enjoyed his society and retained regard for his memory. Nothing but a sense of justice to others could induce him to inflict censure upon Sheridan. He recalls that George Canning had the gratification of offering some pecuniary assistance, and, what was in truth more real service, as well as more agreeable to him, of paying some attention to his early friend in the latter's lest sickness and adversity. Lord Holland says that the want of such attentions from some great personages, and from the Prince Regent in particular, no doubt cut Sheridan to the quick. Lord Holland adds, however, that "when Mr. Moore censures the opulent and titled companions of Mr. Sheridan's happier days for not relieving him from his pecuniary embarrassments, I, whom Moore almost as inaccurately excepts from his censure, am bound to say that it is unjust. To my knowledge, some aid of that nature was offered, and more was possibly accepted than his biographer relates, or than his benefactors ever wished to have recorded." Lord Holland adds that though Sheridan's debts, reported to be enormous, were really of inconsiderable amount, they were of a complicated nature and known only to himself. Without his assistance it would have been impossible, and even with it not easy, to ascertain their extent. He would never have assisted any inquiry or complied with any limitation or arrangement to secure the application of the money raised by his friends exclusively to his creditors. 'Had he even consented to cooperate (which, if my memory does not mislead me, he more than once refused to do), his inveterate habit of subterfuge and misstatement was such that little truth could have been ascertained, and none without affronting and mortifying him. In such circumstances, to impute want of generosity or dereliction of friendship to those who hesitated to afford him pecuniary aid is manifest and gross injustice."

To the author of these memoirs it is, he says, exceedingly painful to chronicle the infirmities of Sheridan's character and the faults of Mr. Moore's book. He feels it, nevertheless, a duty to say that Thomas Moore, in his zeal to exalt his fellow countryman, takes facts for granted, and then draws hasty conclusions not only unfair to the Whig aristocracy, but injurious to that association of public men to whom Sheridan professed himself attached, and of whom, in these memoirs, Lord Holland has constituted himself the historian. He holds that the injustice of those inferences can only be excused by recording the failings that really disqualified Mr. Sheridan for a political station to which his intellectual powers, as well as many other endowments. would have entitled him to rise. According to our author, it was neither Irish birth nor low extraction (as Thomas Moore insinuates) that excluded Mr. Burke or Mr.

Sheridan from a preeminence attained by Lord North, Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt in their respective parties. "Mr. Burke, albeit abounding in knowledge, zeal and genius, and of far less questionable honor and integrity, had yet so little judgment in debate, and so little command of his temper. in council or in society, that it was at all times a problem whether he did more harm or good to the side which he espoused. Had he been placed at the head of a party, he would have been left without followers in the course of a year." Lord Holland thinks that this is a fair inference from Burke's mismanagement of the impeachment of Hastings, and his conduct during the absence of Mr. Fox at the time of the King's illness in 1788. On the latter occasion, in less than six weeks, Burke had ceased to be on speaking terms with any man of consequence in the party.

As for Sheridan, although he was far more disposed to covet and better qualifled to acquire popularity, he is pronounced even less likely to attain the permanent confidence of a body of independent English gentlemen. "I do not speak merely of his dissipation and intemperate habits, though these, toward the close of his life, amounted almost to disqualification, but there were others of a graver nature such as not even his fascinating manners and exquisite wit (for the attainment of special and immediate purposes almost irresistible), could in any protracted commerce or relationship with him counterbalance. Those who enjoyed his society most and knew him best, even while they retained affection for him, were compelled to acknowledge that jealousy of disposition, delight in artifice and contrivance, a proneness gratify his own vanity with disregard of the feelings and reputation of other men, and, above all, an occasional indifference to truth, rendered any habitual reliance on his conduct preposterous in the extreme. The irregularities and mortifications of his early life and education may in a great degree palliate such defects in his moral character, but there is no denying them, and the injudicious endeavor to ascribe all their consequences to the injustice of others has compelled me to record them." It seems that at Harrow Sheridan was slighted by the masters and tormented by the boys as a poor player's

We are told that Sheridan had no great

appetite for general knowledge. Endowed as he was with powers of memory and observation, he had less learning that the common run of well educated men in society. He was conscious of his deficiency, yet he sought to make it appear greater than it really was and concealed the information he had with the hope of giving to his wit and eloquence (often very elaborate) the air of genius and inspiration. He managed this so well that his pleasantry and replies appeared to ordinary acquaintances sudden sallies excited by the occasion, and even to those who suspected them to be studied they were tinctured with a sort of archness and complacency at the opportunity of introducing them which lent them fresh relish and added to their effect in society. Our author thinks that Sheridan was almost as wonderful in his physical constitution as in his intellectual powers. He seemed built for longevity, and no man was better made to bear fatigue, labor or debauch. Even in hearing and seeing he had the advantage of other people. Vain as he was, he, in words and manner and sometimes in actions, acknowledged the superiority of Charles James Fox, and even liked his society as much as he could that of any man who had advantages over him. He was, in other words, less jealous of Fox than he would have been of another in the same situation. The unaffected admiration which he knew Fox entertained and professed for his wit, eloquence and writings in some measure disarmed Sheridan's malignity. "The truth is," says Lord Holland, "that, although vindictive where his vanity had been wounded, Sheridan was not an ill natured man. He could pardon in mathematics, but he had, like him, an injury more readily than a slight, and | memory retentive of numbers as of every either, I fear I must add, more easily than a thing else. It seems that he occasionally great obligation. To inferiors he was not | took an unaccountable pleasure in repeatkind and considerate. Where his own of counting them aloud, especially after Although Richard Brinsley Sheridan was self-love was nowise concerned, he was disa close friend of Charles James Fox, the posed to soothe that of others, and that, too, in cases where he could have no view of courting popularity. Even on his deathbed the old woman put into the house by lest she should lose her dinner by waiting on him that she contracted an attachment for him as strong as if she had attended him from his childhood."

The author of these reminiscences is without reminding the reader that no Englishman since the time of Edmund Waller the three branches of conversation; composition and oratory as the persons whose defects have here been recalled. Lord Holland admits that Sheridan's best speeches rivalled in fame and effect those of had not the characteristic excellences of Burke, Windham or Grattan, they far surpassed in effect the happiest efforts of those three eccentric men. Many years after Sheridan's Begum speech in the House of Commons Fox declared it to have been the best ever delivered within the walls of Parliament House, and Pitt is reported to have been of the same opinion. Sir Gilbert Elliot, afterward Lord Minto, wrote of this speech to Lady Elliot: "It was by many degrees the most excellent and astonishing performance I ever heard, and surpasses all I ever imagined possible in eloquence and ability. Other speakers of his age have shone in written composition. but what modern orator except Sheridan ever produced a masterpiece in any literature?" Burke's best work holds about the same relation to common political pamphlets or ordinary metaphysical disquisitions as the "School for Scandal" bears to the comedies on the English stage. If the conversation of Fox. Windham or Grattan abounded more with philosophy and i nowledge, and if it was occasionally as varied and delightful as Sheridan's yet it was not so well adapted to the tastes of all classes, nor so remarkable for playful satire and vivacity or quick discernment and well bred exposure of individual character. It was, in fine, reserved for Sheridan to be brilliant alike in the club, the theatre and the Senate house.

IV. In a supplementary chapter covering some eighty pages Lord Holland set down whatever he had learned worth commemorating concerning those persons who, whether Englishmen or foreigners, had during his time, without immediate connection with politics, acquired or deserved celebrity for genius or talent, learning or wit, in science, in art, in poetry, in literature or in conversation. Of Horace Walpole, whom he used to visit at Strawberry Hill, he says that "his conversation, like his written compositions, displayed a sprightly mind and a memory stored with anecdotes, historical and literary, the result of much antiquarian research and the fruit of a long life spent in the company of statesmen, authors, artists and wits. In his perextremely artificial, in his temper somewhat susceptible about trifles. His conversation, though much enlivened by fancy and epigram, had great marks of preparation and study, and even effort." It seems that Horace Walpole felt, or pretended to feel, great disgust at the practice adopted by the book making admirers of Dr. Johnson, who scrupled not to commit to print whatever they heard in private conversation. Hence he would suddenly purse up his mouth in a pointed but ludierous manner whenever Boswell came into the room and sit as mute as a fish till that angler for anecdotes and repartee had left him. Our author deems it more than probable that he dreaded and disliked Dr. Johnson himself. "Whig principles. Republican affectation and loose notions of religion were all likely to invite an attack; and I much suspect that Walpole practised some artifice or resorted to some meanness to elude the notice or disarm the hostility of that for midable enemy of fashionable philosophy Of John Hookham Frere, the translator

of Aristophanes, we learn that he had read little or nothing systematically but devoured every book that fell within his reach, and remembered all he met with in such desultory studies with an accuracy almost miraculous. His facility of emotion, combined with a strong propensity to exercise his faculties on every subject presented to his mind, made him a very indulgent critic. He not only saw much more in a book than the author ever intended to convey but frequently built systems on foundations created by his own imagination and in no degree warranted by the work in which he fancied that he had discovered them. Thus in translating Aristophanes he not only proved himsel capable of tasting the satire, poetry and wit of the Greek dramatist, but he len most of those qualities to every indifferent passage of the plays, discerning in every word more than struck the ear and ascribing to the whole composition a systematic and patriotic design which certainly was never professed, and probably was never harbored by Aristophanes himself. According to Frere, it was not gayety, vanity or malignity which induced the great Athenian writer of poetry to libel Socrates the best man that Athens produced, or to expose Euripides, the first writer of tragedies of his time, to the ridicule of the rabble. It was, so Frere maintained, a due sense of the pernicious effects of a mis taken theory of morals and a deliberate apprehenson of the consequences of an enervated and effeminate taste in composition. The scurrility and buffoonery of Aristophanes are, in a word, described as patriotic endeavors to rescue his country-men from the persuasive philosophy of Socrates and the seductive poetry of Eurip-

As to Porson, the great Hellenist, our author concurs with all contemporaries in pronouncing him facile princeps in respect of scholarship. "In memory he was prodigy; in wit and understanding, a much more extraordinary man than such prodigies usually are. Persons intimate with him have assured me that he not only knew most of the ancient poets and all the Greek tragedians by heart, but would repeat nearly yerbatim the notes of the most approved editions. He usually did so when any passage was quoted in his pres ence, specifying the page, the column and the place of the respective editions where the passage itself and the notes he had repeated were to be found. His recollection of words was not confined to poetry or eloquence. He could, and often did recite long and dull comments in Greek Latin and English. He knew all the notes of Gibbon by heart, and when sentences of the text of that historian, or of any of his favorite works, were read or alluded to, he usually finished the paragraph or scene without omitting a word. was not, like Napoleon, a great proficient nerely civil and serviceable, but he was ing large sums, and had a tiresome trick he had drunk much wine, and was disposed by such a test to prove to himself that his faculties were not sensibly impaired thereby. Lord Holland testifies that Porson sacri-

ficed without ostentation great advantages of station and prospects of fortune to conscience. Having eluded the manœuvres and rejected the solicitations of those who urged him to qualify for a clerical fellowship in his college (Trinity, Cambridge). unwilling to close his comments on a man as well as for subsequent preferment, by whose genius had often delighted him taking holy orders, he, from the same scruple and dislike of the Thirty-nine Articles, was willing to forego the favorite has so indisputably attained excellence in object of his ambition, the Greek professorship at Cambridge. When one reflects that he had no private fortune, no rich connections his father was a worsted weaver by trade-and no expectations whatever, such inflexibility of principle Fox, Pitt, Lord North or Canning. If they and self-respect must extort admiration and applause. His conduct is pronounced by Lord Holland the more praiseworthy as it was dictated neither by the vanit of fanaticism nor the zeal of making pros elytes. What Porson's opinions on religion were is not definitely known; at least he never took much pains to promulgate them. Whether he confined his objections to the peculiar creed of the Church of England or denied revelation altogether, Lord Holland could never ascertain.

While resident at the university, although avowedly not orthodox, Porson abstained from all scoffs at Christianity and dis countenanced them in others. His subse quent habits and intimacies must have familiarized him with great freedom of conversation on such topics; and it was generally supposed that he was a sceptic or free thinker. As a scholar and critic, in which capacities his authority was supreme, his testimony was unfavorable to the Trinitarian interpretation of Scripture. His letters to Archdeacon Travis exploded the verse of St. John-the only text approaching to a direct assertion of three persons in the Godhead. His conviction that the New Testament never predicates in positive terms nor implies by fair inference from language the existence of the Trinity seems almost acknowledged in his writings. It was not, so far as Lord Holland could learn, concealed, much less denied, by Porson in conversation. Lord Holland suggests that the Trinitarians. who are disposed to stigmatize their Arlan and Unitarian adversaries as dishonest and ignorant, must be prepared to maintain some strong paradoxes with respect to celebrated men. They must question the sincerity of Lardner and deny the learinng of Milton, Clarke, Porson and Wakefield. In a footnote the author of these memoirs adds to the list such names as Hooker. Newton, Locke, Tillotson, Middleton, Paley and Low, although none of them avowed in direct words, and some distinctly denied all doubts of the Trinity. They are not however, to be counted among those Trinitarians who exclude Arians, or even Socinians, from the pale of Christianity.

Of Porson's repartees Lord Holland preserves two specimens. When some enson he was slender and trim, in his manners | thusiastic admirer of the knot of writers

worth, Southey, and others, predicted that they would be read when Virgil, Milton, Dryden and Pope were forgotten, "I agree with you, and not till then," was the dry and contemptuous answer of Porson. When pressed, after a tiresome metaphysical disquisition by Dr. Parr, to give his opinion on the origin of moral and physical evil: "Why, I think," said he, "doctor, we should have done very well without

VI.

Especially interesting are Lord Holland's recollections of Gibbon, the author of "The Decline and Fail." He tells us that the historian's friends, "with more zeal to drawings and descriptions of his disgusting figure and revolting features. They are not caricatures. His countenance expressed neither quickness nor reflection. No man could have surmised from his inanimate yet hideous face that he possessed such powers of application and such faculties of wit and reasoning as his works unquestionably display, and observant persons might have discovered, though in much fainter lines, in his conversation. His devotion to letters was the most estimable part of his character. gives great interest to his memoirs, which are entertaining and instructive. As to affections, he seems to have had none. He was more like what he admired and produced, a large book, than a living member of society." Lord Holland goes on to recall that Gibbon was affected in his manner and sometimes ludicrously vain. He seems to have imagined himself handsome. When somebody presuming on that foible ventured to try the extent of his concest by telling him he was like Charles James Fox, whose face, full of kindness and intelligence, had nothing in common with his but a sallow complexion and dark eyebrows. Gibbon pettishly replied that "any likeness to Mr. Fox in understanding and disposition he should deem an honor, but he could not be flattered with a supposed and, he hoped, a mistaken resemblance o his person."

Lord Holland was well acquainted in his childhood with Sir Joshua Reynolds and later became a member of the Literary Club, or "The Club," founded by Dr. Johnson in 1763, which was habitually frequented by Reynolds. Sir Joshua is described as "surely the greatest painter England ever produced. Even in his blemishes there was thought, grace and genius. His pictures, if duly elucidate the great truth which his conversation and writings so earnestly and pleasantly inculcated, namely, that to attain excellence in the arts of imitation intellect and fancy, as well as observation and diligence, are requisite. Though neither fluent nor grammatically correct in his familiar language, he had acquired a habit, from his intimacy with Johnson and Burke, that reminded one of the reported conversations of those two extraordinary men and proved that he was one of their school. This habit consisted in a perpetual, and often successful, endeavor to draw some general inference from casual facts or remarks mentioned

in conversation." It used to be asserted that Sir Joshua was assisted in his discourses first by John son and afterward by Burke. It is Lord HoHand's firm belief that he was less as sisted in his writings than in his pictures 'In the mechanical and inferior parts of the latter he certainly employed very largely Northcote, Marchi and other pupils by no means incapable of extending their labors to the more finished portions of the piece a fact I would not invidiously record if it were not. I fear, equally true that munificence, or even friendliness, to such assistants formed no part of his otherwise amiable character. My opinion that his writings are his own is chiefly founded on his conversation." He seems to have had in talking an arch, playful and delicate manner of insinuating philosophical truths. We are told that when one of his vulgar mployers objected to the price of a portrait, saying, "Seventy guineas is a large sum for three or four hours labor, and you have not spent five on this picture." "Not five hours," he exclaimed. "Why I have been nearly all my life about it. Holland points out in a footnote that the story is told of Annibal Carracci, so that, if Sir Joshua used the words above cited he must have stolen them from the biographical account of the Italian painter.

In an appendix Lord Holland relates that in May, 1834, he dined at Norfolk House, and the conversation turned after dinner on the question who was the author of the Junius letters. On this occasion he heard something new and worth remembering Lord Albemarle, a man of a good memory and strict veracity, said that he had once been present at a conversation (after much wine had been drunk) between Mr. Dudley North and Sir Philip Francis. The former rallied the latter somewhat rudely as the author of Junius, said it was vain to deny it, and that everybody so considered him. and took him to task for various opinions and expressions in the work. Francis grew angry, and with more solemnity than was usual with him exclaimed, "Do you then mean, sir, seriously to tell me that I am a scoundrel or a liar? I have denied distinctly my being the author, and after that, they who believe I am must believe me to be a liar, or a scoundrel, or both. Dudley North then changed his batteries. and disclaiming all serious suspicion of Francis's authorship of Junius, proceeded to intimate that Francis would have been unequal to the task, and said some other things to vex him and put him off his guard. At last North said: "In short, it is idle to talk so much about it; we all, in truth, know how it is-Lloyd [private secretary to George Grenville] wrote the letters, and you cor-rected the proofs." Lord Albemarle recalled that Francis at these words seemed startled; he colored, and answered, as the onlookers thought, with emotions of surprise: "You have made much worse guesses sir, in your life than that." Lord Holland says that Albemarle's story tallies with his own impressions of Francis's conversa. tion, inasmuch as he always seemed to know or imply something about Junius but to deny strictly his being the author. M W. H.

European Diplomacy.

Dr. DAVID JAYNE HILL has written, and Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. published, the first volume of A History of Diplomacy. So far as we know, the autho is justified in asserting that no general history of European diplomacy exists in any language. His own conception of the theme which he has undertaken to treat is indicated in a preface. It is his belief that a history of diplomacy properly includes not only an account of the progan exposition of the motives by which it has been inspired and of the results which it has accomplished Even this statement does not fully express the scope of such a history, for an intelligent discussion of the subject must include also a

called "Lake Poets," in extolling Words- consideration of the genesis of the entire international system and of its progress through the successive stages of its devel-Thus regarded, it becomes apopment. rarent that the whole fabric of present international relations is the outcome of past diplomatic activity.

Two preliminary practical problems had to be solved by the author of this work. What limits should be accepted for the plan of treatment? Dr. Hill decided that he would undertake to expound the history of diplomacy only as this is related to the international development of Europe, convinced that by adhering to events of European importance it would be possible to thread the diplomatic labyrinth without confusion, and to present the results of gratify public curiosity than kindness to investigation within reasonable limits. A him, have been at great pains to preserve second problem had to do with the proper point of departure. It is customary to regard the Congress and Peace of Westphalia as the starting point of European diplomacy, but the truth is that these events, while furnishing the internationa code of Europe, were themselves the fruits of a long period of preparation, whose movements provide the only key to the meaning of that code. Dr. Hill's narrative therefore, begins with the condition of the Mediterranean world under the Roman Empire, and brings the instalment offered in the volume before us to a close with the first decade of the fourteenth century. presume that the second and concluding volume will bring the history of European diplomacy down to the Congress of Berlin.

Dr. Hill justly remarks that, although

the date A. D. 476 is usually regarded as

marking the final fall of the Roman Empire

in the West and as the boundary between

the ancient and the mediæval periods of European history, yet, as a matter of fact, the empire had long before ceased to be a reality in the West, and long afterward continued to be treated as a legal fact In the twenty-one preceding years nine nominal emperors had succeeded one another, nearly all of them the helpless as well as the ephemeral creatures of barbarian leaders like Ricimer, Gundobad and Orestes, who, under the name of "Pat rician." or "Master of the Soldiers," had virtually held what central power still remained. Our author nevertheless concedes that the year 476 may, perhaps, as well as any other definite date, be chosen to mark a transition which was in its nature progressive and almost insensible, but which reached a culmination in the embassy sent by Odoacer and the Roman Senate to the Emperor Zeno at Constantinople. significance of that embassy lies in this that it serves to fix in the mind the substitution of local and racial authority in Western Europe for the waning influence of universal imperial rule. It separates the period of European unity under the empire, which it terminates, from the long era of change and disturbance, in which the fragments of the old Roman world sought protection from further invasion and plunder, first, by the organization of barbarian kingdoms, then by Charlemagne's revival of the Roman Empire in the West, later by feudalism and finally by the influence of the Church, until, at last, the solution of the problem was found in the rise of the great national monarchies and the development of the modern State system.

The diplomacy of Zeno in dealing with he embassy of Odoacer, while yielding to the necessity of the moment, guarded successfully the legal rights of the empire and the Emperor never abandoned the intention of restoring the imperial authority when the occasion should offer. The subsequent reconquest of Italy by Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, was made in the name and with the authority of the Emperor, to whom Theodoric still professed

allegiance. It was not owing to a want of forms of intercourse that the various barbarfan kingdoms erected on the ruins of the Roman Empire in the West-the Ostrogothic, Burgundian, Merovingian, Visigothic and Vandalic-did not establish permanent international relations and build up a system of sovereign States like that of modern times. It was rather because there was wanting that settled association between the people and the land which we now know under the name of territorial sovereignty, and because the relations between the peoples, in whose name the kings governed, demanded only the most elementary contract with their neighbors. The great task that lay before them was the formation of political organisms by the blending of the conquering and vanished populations, the revision of their laws and the consolidation of so-

In his third chapter Dr. Hill shows how he collapse of the empire founded by Charlemagne was produced by national rivalries which had already pronounced the doom of universal dominion. The struggle between two opposing ideas-that of a universal monarchy inherited from the Romans and that of local rule derived from the instincts and usages of the Germans, accentuated by the personal ambitions of the national princes-had now become the predominating movement in the political development of Europe. By a combination of circumstances the imperia office had been transferred to a German King in the person of Charles the Fat. The empire had thereby become the appanage of the German kingdom, a realm entirely outside the limits of the old Roman world It was a transfer fraught with incalculable consequences, for it placed the conduct of the empire in the hands of that European nation which of all European peoples was the least Roman. The change marks the beginning of a new era and of a new order of ideas, in which the most antagonistic elements were to be brought into the most intimate relations. The efforts to reconcile their contradictions, destined to a failure not less tragic than the disruption of the empire of Charles the Great, constitute the principal interest of the period depicted in the last five chapters of this book, a period which began with the close of the ninth century and ended with the beginning of the fourteenth. It is well known that in mediæval times

Venice was the city of Western Europe where diplomacy was best understood Our author points out that, following the example of the Byzantines, with whom they were both commercially and politically in constant intercourse, the Venetians had become the possessors of all the arts and institutions of diplomatic relations. The first to practise these arts in Western Europe, Venice became "the school and touchstone of ambassadors." The care and fidelity with which the archives were kept at very early day are attested by the preservation of a diploma dated in the year 883, by which the Emperor Charles the Fat determined the limits of the jurisdiction of Venice. From the first it would appear, although the earliest archives have now been lost, that the Venetian official was obliged to report in writing every measure he took, and every piece of intelligence ress of international intercourse, but also he received. The careful preservation of these records (relazioni) has rendered the Venetian archives, down to the fall of the Republic in 1787, the richest and most varied storehouse of diplomatic history in the world. By virtue of their preeminent merits, the Venetian diplomatists became | them.

the teachers and models of all Europe and long afterward Lord Chesterfield advised his son, in whatever court he might reside, to cultivate by all means the society and friendship of the Venetian Ambassador.

Humor Selected by Mark Twain.

Plenty of amusement will be derived rom the extracts included in "Mark Twain's Library of Humor," "Men and Things." (Harpers.) The gleanings are from a very wide field, and besides their intrinsic merit derive interest as showing a humorist's judgment of other humorists, or rather Mark Twain's idea of what is funny.

He draws on the departed, Artemus Ward. Josh Billings, John Phoenix, the Danbury News man, the Burlington Hawkeye man, besides those of more established literary fame like Oliver Wendell Holmes and George William Curtis. He is very charitable to the newer lights, including some women. He gives plenty of space to W. D. Howells and Charles Dudley Warner.

There are omissions, too, perhaps due to copyright difficulties; we note Max Adeler, Petroleum V. Nasby and Orpheus C. Kerr among the missing. Many may differ with the editor as to his choice of his own pieces and may prefer the "she bear" story or some of the "Innocents Abroad" incidents to the American bill of fare, but this is Mark Twain's own selection and he has a right to please himself. It is all American humor, at any rate, and has variety enough to suit all tastes.

IS ENGLAND A PARASITE? Canadian Writer Holds Her Responsible

for Ten Million Deaths.

The Rev. J. T. Sunderland of Toronto has written a book in which he finds the mother country guilty of "draining the very life" from at least one of her children.

In India 10,000,000 human beings starved to death during a single decade of last century. That number is said to be twice as great as the total of the victims of all the wars in the world during the 107 years from 1793 to 1900-a period which included the Napoleonic wars and the War of the Rebellion.

The famines, so called, which caused this appalling mortality have been commonly attributed to the failure of rain. Mr. Sunderland disputes this.

He says that in one famine year, 1877, there was the enormous rainfall of 66 inches. In 1865-66, another famine year, the rainfall was 60 inches. In 1900 it ranged from 20 to 52 inches. As the English average is only 40 inches and the Scotch only 30 inches Mr. Sunderland says the rainfall cannot be blamed for the famines

In fact he asserts that they are no really famines, anyway. The export of food grains during even the worst of these years seemed to prove that there is never a time when India does not produce enough food for all her millions of inhabitants. The trouble is that the people haven't the money to pay for it.

"It is a famine of money and not of food. says Mr. Sunderland, and this famine he lays to the following causes: 1. A people deprived of self-protection in

rade, commerce and industries. 2. Heavy taxation.

3. A government by foreigners 4. Heavy military expenditures.

6. The drain of wealth to Great Britain.

This drain is variously estimated at from twenty-five to thirty million pounds a year. The taxation according to income is three times that of the English and four times that of the Scotch.

The average yearly income in England is said to be 900 shillings. This is thirty times the average income of the people of India. In Great Britain an average of £4 a person is spent on liquors. This is two and a half times as much as the people of India have to spend on food, drink, clothing, fuel, education, recreation, religion, medicine-everything! Not much

chance to save up for time of need. A Calcutta magazine, the Indian World. in connection with Mr. Sunderland's book; calls England a "stranger" and demands a comparison between Britain ruled India and self-ruled Japan.

"When the British came on the scene India was the leader of Asiatic civilization. She was far in advance of Japan.

"Time has passed. Which country now is in advance? India with her foreign ruler or Japan which has shaped her own development?

"We denounce ancient Rome for impoverishing her provinces and draining their wealth to enrich herself. England is doing exactly the same thing in India. Only she is doing it skilfully, adroitly, by 'enlightened' methods.

"But probe beneath the surface of fine words and we find the same hideous business for which in the end Rome paid so dear. Called by its right name, it is national parasitism. It is one nation living on another.

"This parasitism cannot go on indefinitely. If England averts the doom she must lift India to her side, educate the children, push forward irrigation, im-prove agriculture, build up the ruined manufactures and fill fewer offices with Europeans and more with Indians."

DUCKS KILLED BY THE TON. Pot Hunters in Oregon Threaten to Destroy the Bird Life.

Between 100 and 150 tons of ducks have been killed on the big lakes of Klamath county, Ore., this season. Professional hunters engaged in the slaughter for the San Francisco market and for refrigerator shipment East are menacing the bird life in the southern Oregon lake country.

The hunters establish regular camps at Klamath and Tule lakes, where the fow stop by the million on their way South The wagons call twice or three times a week for the victims, and it is no uncommon thing to see two tons of birds awaiting

transportation at one time.

The law is fragrantly violated by these professional hunters. The Oregon law allows but fifty ducks a week, the California law fifty a day for each hunter. Both Lower Klamath and Tule lakes are crossed by the Oregon-California border. Hunters in Oregon simply embark with their ducks and pull across the California line on those rare occasions when a deputy game warden comes into the district.

The bird life in the Klamath country was

The bird life in the Klamath country was until recently threatened with extermination by hunters of grebes and other birds valuable for their plumage. It is not so many years ago that the spectacle of \$30,000 worth of grebe skins in one pile was seen in Klamath county. Grebes in those days were plentiful around the shores of Lower Klamath and Tule lakes.

plentiful around the shores of Lower Kla-thath and Tule lakes.

With the help of the Audubon societies there has been a lull in the warfare against them and the grebes are not now diminish-ing in number. For two seasons they have been comparatively unmolested.

There are many rare and striking birds in the Oregon-California border country Among them are two or three species of tern, including Forster's variety; the white crane, the little known great blue heron and the big breasted pelican. Among all of these the professional hunter has caused

devastation. Until two years ago the Forster's tern was in danger of extermination. The in-telligence of the tern is not at all commen-surate with its beauty, and ages of isolation, far from disturbing human presence, had bred an unwariness. When one tern, shot dead, would flop down on the water the others would crowd around to see what was the matter. Even a novice could not miss